arXiv:1304.5001v1 [math.PR] 18 Apr 2013

Concentration inequalities via zero bias couplings

Larry Goldstein*and Ümit Işlak
University of Southern California

April 19, 2013

Abstract

For a mean zero random variable Y with positive, finite variance σ^2, the variable Y^* is said to have the Y-zero biased distribution if

$$\mathbb{E}[Yf(Y)] = \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[f'(Y^*)]$$

for all absolutely continuous functions f for which these expectations exist. If Y and such a Y^* can be constructed on a common space such that $|Y^* - Y| \leq C$ for some $C > 0$, and the moment generating function $m(s) = \mathbb{E}[e^{sY}]$ of Y exists on $[0, 1/C)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2(\sigma^2 + Ct)}\right) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,$$

with the same bound holding for the left tail when the $m(s)$ exists on $(-1/C, 0]$. An improvement of these right and left tail bounds for large $|t|$ holds when $m(s)$ exists on $[0, 2/C)$ and $(-2/C, 0]$, respectively. Applications considered include the sum of population characteristics in a simple random sample, and the Hoeffding statistic when the random permutation is uniform over the symmetric group, and when its distribution is constant on conjugacy class.

1 Introduction

The concentration of measure phenomenon for a random variable Y, that is, upper bounds for probabilities of the form $\mathbb{P}(|Y - \mathbb{E}(Y)| \geq t\sqrt{\text{Var}(Y)})$ that typically decay exponentially in t, has attracted the attention of many researchers, see the extensive treatments of [21], [16] and [3], for example. Starting with the work of [4], connections between concentration phenomenon and the couplings used in Stein's method, initiated in [19] and [20], see [5] and [18] for overviews, have also attracted interest. In particular, in [4] the Stein exchangeable

---

[0] AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60E15, 60C05,62G10.

[0] Key words and phrases: Tail probabilities, Coupling, Stein's method

[*] work partially supported by NSA grant H98230-11-1-0162.

pair coupling is applied to derive tail bounds for Hoeffding's combinatorial CLT and the net magnetization in the Curie-Weiss model. The size bias coupling, another popular technique from Stein's method, was put to use in [7], [8] and [1] to produce concentration bounds for the number of relatively ordered subsequences of a random permutation, sliding window statistics, the number of local maxima of a random function on a graph, degrees of random graphs, multinomial occupation models and coverage problems in stochastic geometry.

Here we focus on the zero bias coupling, also borrowed from Stein's method and first introduced in [10], and show how it may be used to yield concentration bounds for the sum Y of population characteristics in a simple random sample, and for the Hoeffding statistic [13] of the form

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i\pi(i)}$$

depending on an array $(a_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le n}$ of real numbers and a random permutation π. The Hoeffding statistic arises in many applications, and in permutation tests in particular, see [22] and [9], for instance. We provide concentration bounds for Y when the distribution of π is uniformly distributed over the symmetric group, and when its distribution depends only on conjugacy class.

The concentration bound of Theorem 1.1 holds for any random variable for which a bounded zero bias coupling exists. We recall from [10] that for any mean zero random variable Y with positive, finite variance σ^2, there exists a distribution for a random variable Y^* satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[Yf(Y)] = \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[f'(Y^*)] \tag{1}$$

for all absolutely continuous functions f for which the expectation of either side exists. The variable Y^* is said to have the Y-zero biased distribution. By Stein's lemma [19] it is known that a random variable Y is normal if and only if $Y =_d Y^*$. For the use of zero bias couplings to produce bounds in normal approximations see [5] and the references therein.

Theorem 1.1 *Let Y be a mean zero random variable with variance $\sigma^2 \in (0, \infty)$ and moment generating function $m(s) = \mathbb{E}[e^{sY}]$, and let Y^* have the Y-zero bias distribution and be defined on the same space as Y.*

If $Y^* - Y \le C$ for some $C > 0$ and $m(s)$ exists for all $s \in [0, 1/C)$, then for all $t \ge 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \ge t) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2(\sigma^2 + Ct)}\right), \tag{2}$$

and the same upper bound holds for $\mathbb{P}(Y \le -t)$ if $Y - Y^* \le C$ when $m(s)$ exists for all $s \in (-1/C, 0]$. If $|Y^* - Y| \le C$ and $m(s)$ exists on $(-1/C, 1/C)$ then $P(|Y| \ge t)$ is bounded by twice the right hand side of (2).

If $|Y^* - Y| \le C$ for some $C > 0$ and $m(s)$ exists for all $s \in [0, 2/C)$ then for all $t \ge 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \ge t) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4\sigma^2 + Ct}\right), \tag{3}$$

with the same upper bound holding for $\mathbb{P}(Y \le -t)$ if $m(s)$ exists in $(-2/C, 0]$, and if in $(-2/C, 2/C)$ then $P(|Y| \ge t)$ is bounded by twice the right hand side of (3).

We remark that if $|Y^* - Y| \le C$ and $m(s)$ exists in $[0, 2/C)$, then, for the right tail say, the bound (2) is preferred over (3) for $|t| < 2\sigma^2/C$. In typical applications the variance of Y grows as $O(n)$, in which case the first set of bounds is preferred over a set increasing to $\mathbb{R}$ asymptotically.

Comparisons between the bounds obtained by the well known Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, the use of self bounding functions [17], and the size bias method of [7] and [8] are discussed in [1], where it is shown that the latter two methods may yield improvements of the former. In brief, when Y has mean μ and is a function of n independent random variables the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality yields a bound for the right tail of Y of the form

$$\mathbb{P}(Y - \mu \ge t) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2}\right), \tag{4}$$

where c_i is a bound on how much Y can change upon varying the i^{th} independent variable. In typical applications the order of the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2$ may grow as $O(n)$. In contrast, the method of self bounding functions and the size bias method yield bounds that are expressed in terms of the mean μ, and in the latter case in particular yield the right tail bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y - \mu \ge t\right) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2C(\mu + t)}\right) \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \tag{5}$$

and the left tail bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y - \mu \le -t\right) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2C\mu}\right) \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \tag{6}$$

where C is a constant that does not depend on n.

There are regimes where the mean μ grows at a slower rate than n, and where, consequently, (5) and (6) produce bounds that serve a needed purpose, but where (4) would not be adequate, see [1]. To take one simple example from [1], when Y has the Binomial $\mathcal{B}(n, p)$ distribution, the bounds (5) and (6) hold with $C = 1$, and hence, in the case $p \in (0, 1/2]$, taking the minimum of the bounds for Y and $n - Y$, we obtain the right tail bound

$$\mathbb{P}(Y - np \ge t) \le \begin{cases} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2(np+t)}) & 0 \le t \le n(1-2p) \\ \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2n(1-p)}) & t > n(1-2p), \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

which is a strict improvement over the application of (4) in this case, where c_i must be taken to be one, and hence $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2 = n$.

In contrast to the bounds (5) and (6), depending on the mean μ of Y, the bound of Theorem 1.1 depends on the variance σ^2, and may lead to further improvements. Again taking the Binomial case to illustrate, setting $W = Y - \mu$, a result we recall in Section 3 shows that when W is the sum of independent non-trivial centered Bernoulli variables, a W^* having the W-zero bias distribution can be constructed by replacing one centered summand $X_i - p$ by an independent variable having that summands zero bias distribution. As (10) gives that the replaced variable must obey the same boundedness condition as the original one, we obtain $|Y^* - Y| \le 1$, and (2) and (3) respectively yield the right tail bounds

$$\mathbb{P}(Y - np \ge t) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2np(1-p) + 2t}\right), \quad \mathbb{P}(Y - np \ge t) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4np(1-p) + t}\right). \tag{8}$$

The first inequality in (8) improves on the size bias bound (7) for $0 \le t \le n(1-2p)$, and the second for $n(1-2p) < t < 2n(1-p)(1-2p)$ for $p \in (0,1/2]$, with additional improvements obtained for more restricted ranges of p. In particular these bounds also improve on the Azuma-Hoeffding bound (4) for this case.

Finally, we note that the conclusions of Theorem 1.1 remain true in the case $C = 0$, that is, when Y is a mean zero normal random variable. In this instance inequality (2) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \ge t) \le \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) \quad \text{for } t \ge 0,$$

which is well known to be optimal by the standard Mill's ratio inequalities.

2 Proof of the main result

We state two properties of the zero bias distribution that will be applied below. First, from (1), it is easy to see that whenever $a \neq 0$, we have

$$(aY)^* =_d aY^*. \tag{9}$$

Next, from [10], if Y is bounded by some constant, then Y^* is also bounded by the same constant, that is,

$$|Y| \le c \quad \text{implies} \quad |Y^*| \le c. \tag{10}$$

We now present the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof: If the moment generating function $m(s)$ of Y exists in an open interval containing s we may interchange expectation and differentiation at s and obtain

$$m'(s) = \mathbb{E}[Ye^{sY}] = \sigma^2\mathbb{E}[se^{sY^*}] = \sigma^2 s m^*(s), \tag{11}$$

where we have set $m^*(s) = \mathbb{E}[e^{sY^*}]$, and applied the zero bias relation (1) to yield the second equality.

We first prove (2). Starting with the well known inequality $1 - x \le e^{-x}$, holding for all $x \ge 0$, we obtain

$$e^x \le \frac{1}{1-x} \quad \text{for } x \in [0,1).$$

Hence, for $\theta \in (0, 1/C)$ and $0 \le s \le \theta$ we have

$$m^*(s) = \mathbb{E}[e^{sY^*}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{s(Y^*-Y)}e^{sY}] \le e^{sC}m(s) \le \frac{1}{1-sC}m(s).$$

Using the identity (11) to express $m^*(s)$ in terms of $m'(s)$ we obtain

$$m'(s) \le \frac{\sigma^2 s}{1-sC}m(s).$$

Dividing both sides by $m(s)$, integrating over $[0,\theta]$ and using that $m(0) = 1$ we obtain

$$\log m(\theta) = \int_0^\theta \frac{m'(s)}{m(s)}ds \le \frac{\sigma^2}{1-\theta C}\int_0^\theta s ds = \frac{\sigma^2\theta^2}{2(1-\theta C)},$$

and exponentiation yields

$$m(\theta) \le \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2\theta^2}{2(1-\theta C)}\right).$$

As (2) holds trivially for $t = 0$ consider $t > 0$ and apply Markov's inequality to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \ge t) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\theta Y} \ge e^{\theta t}) \le e^{-\theta t} m(\theta) \le \exp\left(-\theta t + \frac{\sigma^2\theta^2}{2(1-\theta C)}\right).$$

Setting $\theta = t/(\sigma^2 + Ct)$, and noting this value lies in the interval $(0, 1/C)$, (2) follows.

If now $Y - Y^* \le C$ then letting $X = -Y$ we see from (9) with $a = -1$ that $-Y^*$ has the X-zero bias distribution, and applying (2) for the coupling of X to $X^* = -Y^*$ now yields the claimed left tail inequality, and hence the bound for $P(|Y| \ge t)$.

Turning to (3), by the convexity of the exponential function we have

$$\frac{e^y - e^x}{y - x} = \int_0^1 e^{ty+(1-t)x} dt \le \int_0^1 (te^y + (1-t)e^x) dt = \frac{e^y + e^x}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \ne y,$$

and hence

$$e^y - e^x \le \frac{|y - x|(e^y + e^x)}{2} \quad \text{for all } x \text{ and } y.$$

In particular, as $|Y^* - Y| \le C$, for all $\theta \in (0, 2/C)$ and $0 \le s \le \theta$,

$$e^{sY^*} - e^{sY} \le \frac{|s(Y^* - Y)|(e^{sY^*} + e^{sY})}{2} \le \frac{Cs}{2}(e^{sY^*} + e^{sY}). \tag{12}$$

Taking expectation in (12) yields

$$m^*(s) - m(s) \le \frac{Cs}{2}(m^*(s) + m(s)),$$

and rearranging yields

$$m^*(s) \le \left(\frac{1 + Cs/2}{1 - Cs/2}\right) m(s). \tag{13}$$

Applying relation (11) in (13) we have

$$m'(s) \le \sigma^2 s \left(\frac{1 + Cs/2}{1 - Cs/2}\right) m(s),$$

and dividing both sides by $m(s)$ we obtain

$$\frac{m'(s)}{m(s)} \le \sigma^2 s \left(\frac{1 + Cs/2}{1 - Cs/2}\right) \le \frac{2\sigma^2 s}{1 - C\theta/2}.$$

Since $m(0) = 1$, integration on $[0, \theta]$ yields

$$\log m(\theta) = \int_0^\theta \frac{m'(s)}{m(s)} ds \le \int_0^\theta \frac{2\sigma^2 s}{1 - C\theta/2} ds = \frac{\sigma^2\theta^2}{1 - C\theta/2},$$

and exponentiating we obtain

$$m(\theta) \le \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2\theta^2}{1-C\theta/2}\right) \quad \text{for all } \theta \in (0,2/C). \tag{14}$$

Noting that the result holds trivially for $t=0$, fix $t>0$ and $\theta \in (0,2/C)$. Arguing as before, (14) and Markov's inequality yield

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \ge t) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\theta Y} \ge e^{\theta t}) \quad \le \quad e^{-\theta t} m(\theta) \le \exp\left(-\theta t + \frac{\sigma^2\theta^2}{1-C\theta/2}\right).$$

Letting $\theta = t/(2\sigma^2 + Ct/2)$, and noting that this value lies in $(0,2/C)$, we obtain the asserted right tail inequality (3). We now repeat the argument above to obtain the two remaining claims.

3 Construction of zero bias couplings

In this section we will review constructions of zero bias couplings in different settings. Details can be found in [5].

3.1 Zero biasing independent sums

For illustration we consider zero biased coupling constructions in the simplest case, where Y is a sum of independent, mean zero random variables each having a finite, positive variance. As formalized in the following proposition, the zero biased distribution of such a sum can be constructed by choosing a summand with probability proportional to its variance, and replacing it with a variable from its own zero bias distribution.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent, mean zero random variables with finite, positive variances $\sigma_1^2, \ldots, \sigma_n^2$ and set*

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i.$$

Then with $\sigma^2 = \sigma_1^2 + \cdots + \sigma_n^2$ and I a random index independent of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ having distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(I=i) = \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sigma^2}, \tag{15}$$

and X_i^* having the X_i–zero bias distribution, independent of $X_j, j \ne i$ and of I, the variable

$$Y^* = Y - X_I + X_I^*$$

has the Y-zero biased distribution.

3.2 Use of the exchangeable pair

The next construction, due to [10], is based on the existence of λ-Stein pairs, that is, exchangeable variables (Y', Y'') that satisfy the linearity condition

$$\mathbb{E}[Y''|Y'] = (1-\lambda)Y' \quad \text{for some } \lambda \in (0,1).$$

Proposition 3.2 *Let (Y', Y'') be a λ-Stein pair with $Var(Y') = \sigma^2 \in (0,\infty)$ and distribution $F(y', y'')$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y'] = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(Y' - Y'')^2 = 2\lambda\sigma^2,$$

and when $(Y^\dagger, Y^\ddagger)$ has distribution

$$dF^\dagger(y', y'') = \frac{(y'-y'')^2}{\mathbb{E}(Y'-Y'')^2} dF(y', y''), \tag{16}$$

and $U \sim U[0,1]$ is independent of $(Y^\dagger, Y^\ddagger)$, the variable

$$Y^* = UY^\dagger + (1-U)Y^\ddagger \tag{17}$$

has the $Y'-$zero biased distribution.

In the typical uses of the coupling construction suggested by Proposition 3.2, including those in Sections 4.2, 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 below, given Y', we first construct Y'' close to Y', such that (Y', Y'') is a λ-Stein pair, and use it to form the difference $Y' - Y''$ that appears in (16). Then, perhaps independently, one constructs the parts of $Y^\dagger, Y^\ddagger$ that depend on the "square biased" term $(Y'-Y'')^2$. Finally, one constructs the remaining parts of $Y^\dagger, Y^\ddagger$ by using, as much as possible, the corresponding parts of Y', Y'' to achieve variables $Y^\dagger, Y^\ddagger$ that are close and have joint distribution $dF^\dagger(y', y'')$.

In many applications the construction just described results in S, a function of the variables which can be kept fixed, and variables $T', T^\dagger$ and $T^\ddagger$, all on a joint space, such that

$$Y' = S + T', \quad Y^\dagger = S + T^\dagger, \quad \text{and} \quad Y^\ddagger = S + T^\ddagger. \tag{18}$$

When $T', T^\dagger$ and $T^\ddagger$ are all bounded by B, (17) gives

$$|Y^* - Y'| = |UT^\dagger + (1-U)T^\ddagger - T'| \le U|T^\dagger| + (1-U)|T^\ddagger| + |T'| \le 2B. \tag{19}$$

4 Applications

In all our applications that follow we consider random variables Y that are bounded, and hence make no further mention of the conditions on the moment generating function in Theorem 1.1.

4.1 Sum of independent random variables

Applying the construction of Proposition 3.1 to a sum of bounded independent random variables we obtain a version of the classical Bernstein inequality.

Theorem 4.1 *Let* $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ *be independent mean zero random variables with variances* $\sigma_i^2 = Var(X_i) \in (0, \infty)$*, and that satisfy* $|X_i| \le c$ *for all* $i = 1, \ldots, n$*. Then all the bounds of Theorem 1.1 hold for* $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ *with* $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$*, and* C *replaced by* $2c$*.*

Proof: By Proposition 3.1, we can form Y^* by replacing a single summand, selected independently with probability probability (15) proportional to its variance, by a random variable independent of the remaining summands and having that summand's zero bias distribution. Thus

$$|Y^* - Y| = |X_I^* - X_I| \le 2c$$

using (10), and Theorem 1.1 now obtains.

4.2 Simple random sampling

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a collection of real valued characteristics of a population of size N, not all equal, and let Y be the sum of the characteristics of a simple random sample of size n. With $\overline{a}$ the average of the elements of $\mathcal{A}$, a straightforward calculation yields that the mean μ and variance σ^2 of Y are given by

$$\mu = n\overline{a} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{n(N-n)}{N(N-1)} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} (a - \overline{a})^2. \tag{20}$$

Theorem 4.2 *Let* $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ *be a random sample of size* n *from a set* $\mathcal{A}$ *of* N *real numbers, not all equal, with* n *and* N *satisfying* $2 < n < N - 1$*. Then with* $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$*, the bounds of Theorem 1.1 hold with* Y *replaced by* $Y - \mu$*, the mean* μ *and variance* σ^2 *given in (20), and*

$$C = 6 \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |a - \overline{a}|.$$

Proof: Center by replacing Y and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ by $Y - \mu$, and $a - \overline{a}$ respectively. When $2 < n < N - 1$, if $\{X', X'', X_2, \ldots, X_n\}$ is a simple random sample of size $n + 1$ from $\mathcal{A}$, it is shown in [12] that (Y', Y'') given by

$$Y' = X' + \sum_{i=2}^{n} X_i \quad \text{and} \quad Y'' = X'' + \sum_{i=2}^{n} X_i$$

form a λ-Stein pair with $\lambda = N/(n(N-n)) \in (0,1)$. In addition, independently sampling $X^\dagger, X^\ddagger$ according to the distribution

$$q(a,b) = \frac{(a-b)^2}{2N} \mathbf{1}(\{a,b\} \subset \mathcal{A}),$$

one can find a zero bias coupling Y^* to Y' satisfying the decomposition (18) with

$$S = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}} a, \quad T' = X' + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{R}'} a, \quad T^\dagger = X^\dagger + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger} a \quad \text{and} \quad T^\ddagger = X^\ddagger + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger} a,$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} = \{X_2, ..., X_n\} \setminus \{X^\dagger, X^\ddagger\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}' = \{X_2, \ldots, X_n\} \cap \{X^\dagger, X^\ddagger\},$$

with $\mathcal{R}^\dagger$ obtained by taking a simple random sample of size $|\mathcal{R}'|$ from the complement of

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{X_2, \ldots, X_n\} \cup \{X^\dagger, X^\ddagger\}.$$

As $\mathcal{R}'$ and $\mathcal{R}^\dagger$ are of size at most 2, the variables $T', T^\dagger$ and $T^\ddagger$ are all bounded by $B = 3\max_{a\in\mathcal{A}}|a|$. Hence by (19) there exists a coupling of Y and Y^* with $|Y^* - Y| \le 2B$. Theorem 1.1 now obtains.

4.3 Hoeffding's permutation statistics

Let π be a random permutation in the symmetric group S_n and $A = (a_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n}$ an $n \times n$ matrix with real entries. Hoeffding's statistic, of the form

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i,\pi(i)} \tag{21}$$

arises in a number of contexts, permutation testing problems foremost among them; see [22] for a seminal reference, and [9] and references within. Hoeffding's combinatorial central limit theorem [13] gives conditions under which Y, properly centered and scaled, has an asymptotic normal distribution. The rate of convergence of Y to its normal limit is well studied, see for instance [5] and references therein. Here we apply Theorem 1.1 to obtain concentration inequalities for Y.

4.3.1 Uniform Distribution on Permutations

First we consider the case where π in (21) is chosen uniformly over S_n. Letting

$$a_{i\bullet} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}, \quad a_{\bullet j} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad a_{\bullet\bullet} = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij},$$

straightforward calculations show that the mean μ_A and variance σ_A^2 of Y are given by

$$\mu_A = n a_{\bullet\bullet} \tag{22}$$

and

$$\sigma_A^2 = \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{1\le i,j\le n}(a_{ij}^2 - a_{i\bullet}^2 - a_{\bullet j}^2 + a_{\bullet\bullet}^2) = \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{1\le i,j\le n}(a_{ij} - a_{i\bullet} - a_{\bullet j} + a_{\bullet\bullet})^2. \tag{23}$$

Theorem 4.3 *Let $n \ge 3$ and $A = (a_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n}$ be an array of real numbers such that, with μ_A and σ_A^2 given by (22) and (23) respectively, the variance σ_A^2 is non-zero. Let π be a random permutation uniformly distributed over S_n and Y be as in (21). Then the bounds of Theorem 1.1 hold with Y replaced by $Y - \mu_A$, σ^2 by σ_A^2 and*

$$C = 8\max_{1\le i,j\le n}|a_{ij} - a_{i\bullet}|. \tag{24}$$

Proof: Relabel Y and π as Y' and π', respectively, and center by replacing Y' by $Y' - \mu_A$ and a_{ij} by $a_{ij} - a_{i\cdot}$. With τ_{ij} the transposition that interchanges i and j, that is, $\tau_{ij}(i) = j, \tau_{ij}(j) = i$ and $\tau_{ij}(k) = k$ for all $k \notin \{i, j\}$, it is shown in [11] that by sampling I, J uniformly from $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ over all distinct pairs, independently of π', that Y' and

$$Y'' = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i,\pi''(j)}$$

form a λ-Stein pair with $\lambda = 2/(n-1)$ when $\pi'' = \pi' \tau_{I,J}$.

Following [11], see also [5], and the outline given in Section 3.2, to construct $Y^\dagger$ and $Y^\ddagger$, sample $I^\dagger$,$J^\dagger$,$K^\dagger$,$L^\dagger$, independently of the remaining variables, from the distribution

$$p_2(i, j, k, l) = \frac{[(a_{ik} + a_{jl}) - (a_{il} + a_{jk})]^2}{4n^2(n-1)\sigma^2},$$

and set

$$\pi^\dagger = \begin{cases} \pi \tau_{\pi^{-1}(K^\dagger), J^\dagger} & \text{if } L^\dagger = \pi(I^\dagger), K^\dagger \neq \pi(J^\dagger) \\ \pi \tau_{\pi^{-1}(L^\dagger), I^\dagger} & \text{if } L^\dagger \neq \pi(I^\dagger), K^\dagger = \pi(J^\dagger) \\ \pi \tau_{\pi^{-1}(K^\dagger), I^\dagger} \tau_{\pi^{-1}(L^\dagger), J^\dagger} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $\pi^\ddagger = \pi^\dagger \tau_{I^\dagger, J^\dagger}$. Then with $\mathcal{I} = \{I^\dagger, \pi^{-1}(K^\dagger), J^\dagger, \pi^{-1}(L^\dagger)\}$ the decomposition (18) holds with

$$S = \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{I}} a_{i,\pi'(i)}, \quad T' = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_{i,\pi'(i)}, \quad T^\dagger = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_{i,\pi^\dagger(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad T^\ddagger = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_{i,\pi^\ddagger(i)}.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}$ is a set of size at most 4, by (19) we find that there exists a coupling of the centered variable Y' to a random variable having its zero bias distribution with the distance between the two bounded by C of (24). Theorem 1.1 now obtains.

Remark 4.1 *Letting* $||a|| = \max_{1 \le i,j \le n} |a_{ij} - a_{i\cdot}|$, *note that for* $n \ge 3$ *the variance* σ_A^2 *in (23) can be bounded as*

$$\sigma_A^2 \le \frac{2n^2}{n-1} ||a||^2 \le 3n||a||^2.$$

Thus, bound derived from (2), for instance, of Theorem 1.1 can be upper bounded in terms of $||a||$ *as*

$$\mathbb{P}(|Y - \mu_A| \ge t) \le 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{6n||a||^2 + 16||a||t}\right).$$

Remark 4.2 *In [4] the concentration bound*

$$\mathbb{P}(|Y - \mu_A| \ge t) \le 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4\mu_A + 2t}\right) \tag{25}$$

of the Hoeffding statistic Y *is shown under the additional condition that* $0 \le a_{i,j} \le 1$ *for all* i, j. *Under this condition one can take* $C = 8$ *in (24), and Theorem 4.3 yields*

$$\mathbb{P}(|Y - \mu_A| \ge t) \le 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_A^2 + 16t}\right). \tag{26}$$

In particular, the bound (26) will be smaller than (25) whenever $t \leq (2\mu_A - \sigma_A^2)/7$.

Moreover, when $a_{ij}, 1 \leq i,j \leq n$ *are themselves independent random variables with law* $\mathcal{L}(U)$ *having support in* $[0,1]$, *then*

$$\mathbb{E}\sigma_A^2 = (n-1)\,Var(U) \leq (n-1)\mathbb{E}(U^2) < n\mathbb{E}(U) = \mathbb{E}\mu_A,$$

where the first equality follows by a calculation using the first expression for the variance in (23), and applying $0 \leq U \leq 1$ *to yield* $\mathbb{E}U^2 \leq \mathbb{E}U$ *for use in the strict inequality. Hence if the array entries behave as independent random variables on* $[0,1]$, *(26) will be asymptotically preferred to (25) everywhere.*

4.3.2 Permutation distribution constant on conjugacy classes

We now consider Hoeffding's statistic

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i\pi(i)}$$

when the distribution of π is constant over cycle type. This framework includes two special cases of note, one where π is a uniformly chosen fixed point free involution, considered by Goldstein and Rinott [9] and Ghosh [6], having applications to permutation testing in certain matched pair experiments, and the other where π has the uniform distribution over permutations with a single cycle, considered by Kolchin and Chistyakov [15], under the additional restriction that $a_{ij} = b_i c_j$. Bounds on the error of the normal approximation to Y when the distribution of π is constant over cycle type were derived in [11].

We start by recalling some relevant definitions. For $q = 1, \ldots, n$ letting $c_q(\pi)$ be the number of q cycles of π, the vector

$$c(\pi) = (c_1(\pi), \ldots, c_n(\pi))$$

is the cycle type of π. For instance, the permutation $\pi = ((1,3,7,5),(2,6,4))$ in S_7 consists of one 4 cycle in which $1 \to 3 \to 7 \to 5 \to 1$, and one 3 cycle where $2 \to 6 \to 4 \to 2$, and hence has cycle type $(0,0,1,1)$. We say the permutations π and σ are of the same cycle type if $c(\pi) = c(\sigma)$, and that a distribution P on S_n is constant on cycle type if $P(\pi)$ depends only on $c(\pi)$, that is

$$\mathbb{P}(\pi) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma) \quad \text{whenever} \quad c(\pi) = c(\sigma).$$

Clearly a vector $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ of nonnegative integers is a cycle type of some permutation if and only if $\sum_i ic_i = n$. Given such a vector c, a special case of a distribution constant on cycle type is one uniformly distributed over all permutations having cycle type c, denoted $\mathcal{U}(c)$. The situations where π is uniformly chosen from the set of all fixed point free involutions, and chosen uniformly from all permutations having a single cycle, are both distributions of type $\mathcal{U}(c)$, the first with $c = (0, n/2, 0, \ldots, 0)$ for even n and the second with $c = (0,0,\ldots,0,1)$.

In general we consider distributions $\mathcal{U}(c)$ for which $c_1(1) = 0$, that is, where π has no fixed points, as is true for the two special cases of most interest. Noting that under this condition no expression of the form a_{ii} appears in the sum (21), let

$$a_{io} = \frac{1}{n-2}\sum_{j:j\neq i}^{n} a_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad a_{oo} = \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)}\sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}.$$

Under the symmetry condition $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$ for all $i \neq j$, from [5], the mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}[Y]$ and variance $\sigma_c^2 = \mathrm{Var}(Y)$ for $n \geq 4$ are given by

$$\mu = (n-2)a_{oo} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_c^2 = \left(\frac{1}{n-1} + \frac{2c_2}{n(n-3)}\right) \sum_{i \neq j} (a_{ij} - 2a_{io} + a_{oo})^2. \tag{27}$$

When n is even and c is the cycle type of a fixed point free involution, then $c_2 = n/2$ and the variance in (27) specializes to

$$\sigma_c^2 = \frac{2(n-2)}{(n-1)(n-3)} \sum_{i \neq j} (a_{ij} - 2a_{io} + a_{oo})^2. \tag{28}$$

When c is the cycle type of permutations that have no two cycles, such as is the case for $n \geq 4$ and permutations having only one long cycle, the variance in (27) becomes

$$\sigma_c^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i \neq j} (a_{ij} - 2a_{io} + a_{oo})^2. \tag{29}$$

For an array $(a_{ij})_{i \neq j}$ let

$$a_o = \max_{i \neq j} |a_{ij} - 2a_{io} + a_{oo}|. \tag{30}$$

Theorem 4.4 *Let $n \geq 5$ and $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ be an array of real numbers satisfying $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$, and for some cycle type c without fixed points let $\pi \in S_n$ have the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(c)$. Then the bounds of Theorem 1.1 hold with Y replaced by $Y - \mu$ and σ^2 replaced by σ_c^2, where μ and σ_c^2 are given by (27), and C replaced by $40a_o$ with a_o of (30).*

In the special case when n is even and π is uniformly distributed over involutions without fixed points, the same bounds hold with σ^2 given by σ_c^2 of (28), and $C = 24a_o$.

Proof: When π has the $\mathcal{U}(c)$ distribution, the constructions of [11] and [5], similar to those used in the proof of Theorem 4.3, provide a zero biased coupling for $Y - \mu$ that satisfies

$$|(Y-\mu)^* - (Y-\mu)| \leq 40a_o,$$

and further show that the constant 40 can be replaced by 24 in the case of fixed point free involutions. Theorem 1.1 now obtains.

References

[1] Arratia, R., Bartroff, J., Goldstein, L. and Işlak, Ü. *Bounded size biased couplings for log concave distributions and concentration of measure for occupancy models.* Preprint.

[2] Azuma, K. (1967). *Weighted Sums of Certain Dependent Random Variables.* Tôhoku Math. Journ., **19**, 357367

[3] Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G. and Massart, P. (2013). *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*, Oxford University Press.

[4] Chatterjee, S. (2007). *Stein's method for concentration inequalities*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 138, 305-321.

[5] Chen, L.H.Y., Goldstein, L. and Shao, Q. M. (2011). *Normal approximation by Stein's method.* Springer; Berlin, Heidelberg.

[6] Ghosh, S. (2009). *L^p bounds for a combinatorial central limit theorem with involutions* (Preprint)

[7] Ghosh, S. and Goldstein, L. (2011). *Concentration of measures via size biased couplings*, Probability Theory and Related Fields, **149**, pp. 271-278.

[8] Ghosh, S. and Goldstein, L. (2011). *Applications of size biased couplings for concentration of measures*, Electronic Communications in Probability, **16**, pp. 70-83.

[9] Goldstein, L. and Rinott, Y. (2003). *A permutation test for matching and its asymptotic distribution.* Metron, 61, pp. 375-388.

[10] Goldstein, L., and Reinert, G. (1997). *Stein's method and the zero bias transformation with application to simple random sampling,* Ann. Appl. Probab., 7, pp. 935-952. arXiv:math.PR/0510619

[11] Goldstein, L. (2005). *Berry Esseen Bounds for Combinatorial Central Limit Theorems and Pattern Occurrences, using Zero and Size Biasing*, Jour. of Appl. Probab, **42**, pp. 661–683.

[12] Goldstein, L., (2007). *L^1 Bounds in Normal Approximation,*, Ann. of Probab., **35**, pp. 1888–1930.

[13] Hoeffding, W. (1951). *A combinatorial central limit theorem.* Ann. Math. Stat., **22**, pp. 558-566.

[14] Hoeffding, W. (1963). *Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **58**, pp. 1330

[15] Kolchin, V. F., and Chistyakov, V. P. (1973). *On a combinatorial limit theorem.* Theory of Probability and Its Applications, **18**, 728739.

[16] Ledoux, M. (2001). *The concentration of measure phenomenon*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.

[17] McDiarmid, C. and Reed, B. (2006). *Concentration for self-bounding functions and an inequality of Talagrand*, Random Structures & Algorithms, **29**, pp. 549-557.

[18] Ross, Nathan F. (2011). *Fundamentals of Stein's method*, Probability Surveys, **8**, pp. 210-293.

[19] Stein, C. (1972). A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables, *Proc. Sixth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab.* **2**, 583-602, Univ. California Press, Berkeley.

[20] Stein, C. (1986). Approximate Computation of Expectations. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Hayward, CA.

[21] Talagrand, M. (1995). *Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces*, Publ. Math Inst. Hautes Étud Sci. **81**, 73205.

[22] Wald, A. and Wolfowitz, J. (1944) *Statistical tests based on permutations of the observations*, Ann. Math. Stat. **15**, 358-372.